

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRENDA SANDERS,

Plaintiff,
v.

Case No. 16-12959

HON. AVERN COHN

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT, MICHIGAN
JUDICIAL TENURE COMMISSION, EQUAL
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, DR. NORMAN L. MILLER,
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION,
MICHIGAN ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD,
CITY OF DETROIT, a municipal Corporation,
LAIDLER & ZIELINSKI, PLLC, CYRIL HALL,
COLLINS, EINHORN, FARRELL, PC.,
and the 36TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 188)
AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR TRO (Doc. 125)

On August 15, 2016, plaintiff proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a complaint against the above named defendants. As best as can be gleaned, plaintiff claims violations of state and federal law relating to proceedings before the Michigan Supreme Court and Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission which resulted in her removal from the bench upon a finding that she is "mentally unfit." She also claims violations of federal law during her employment as a state district court judge, including Title VII (race, religion, and gender discrimination) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Pretrial matters have been referred to a magistrate judge. (Doc. 85).

Plaintiff then filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO). (Doc. 125). The magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation, MJRR, recommending that the motions be denied.¹ (Doc. 188). To date, no objections have been filed and the time for filing objections has passed.

The failure to file objections to the report and recommendation waives any further right to appeal. Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir.1987). Likewise, the failure to object to the magistrate judge's report releases the Court from its duty to independently review the motions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). However, the Court has reviewed the MJRR and agrees with the magistrate judge. Accordingly, the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are ADOPTED as the findings and conclusions of the Court. Plaintiff's motion for a TRO is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

s/Avern Cohn
AVERN COHN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 26, 2018
Detroit, Michigan

¹The Magistrate Judge also noted that plaintiff had filed two other motions for a TRO (Docs. 176, 177) which the Magistrate Judge recommended be denied. (Doc. 178). The Court agreed and denied the motions. (Doc. 181).